

It is the intellectual center of the Army. It hosts our Nation's best and brightest warfighters at the Command and General Staff College, which also hosts 100 international officers every year.

I want to remind my colleagues just how important Fort Leavenworth's mission is to the Army and to our national security and of the risk that this entire mission would be endangered by making it a terrorist prison.

Fort Leavenworth is home to the U.S. Army's Training and Doctrine Command Combined Arms Center. The Combined Arms Center oversees 13 schools, including the Command and General Staff College. Most recently, Fort Leavenworth was named the "Army University," giving our intellectual center of the Army an official title. Since 1881, the Command and General Staff College and the Combined Arms Center have been engaged in the primary mission of preparing the Army and its leaders for war.

In order to accomplish critical missions, Fort Leavenworth develops and integrates Army leader development, doctrine education, lessons learned, functional training, training support, training development, and proponent responsibilities in order to support mission command and to prepare the Army to successfully conduct unified land operations in a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational environment—a lot of words. It is a big mission, an important mission. To degrade Fort Leavenworth to a terrorist prison would have ominous repercussions to our professional military and the value it serves every American and our national security.

In addition, we must consider how our allies will respond to having enemy combatants so close to their top military leaders training at Fort Leavenworth. In my effort to reach out to Embassies tied to the school, all have expressed their deep support for the International Military Officers Division, its value to their military and security, and the importance of maintaining the program at Fort Leavenworth. There is every possibility that the countries that participate in the Command and General Staff College would reconsider their participation given the relocation of terrorists. This would bring negative consequences and represent a terrible detriment to the partnership building that takes place during their course work. It would mean a loss of international cooperation for American military education and our national security.

There are so many imperative factors that must be examined at Fort Leavenworth, in Colorado, and in South Carolina, factors that we cannot ignore. The fact that the FBI has nearly 1,000 investigations into ISIS activity within the United States and all 50 States, that ISIS released a video right after the attacks in Paris stating that the United States was next, and, most important, the fact that we are not deal-

ing with everyday criminals—the detainees currently held at Guantanamo Bay are enemy combatants, terrorists, individuals with no remorse, and with a recidivism of 30 percent and a strong desire to return to the battlefield. The reality is, these individuals and the organizations they support pose the greatest risk to national security we face today.

This administration should not obstruct the will of Congress reflecting the voice of the American people, which has prohibited this White House from transferring detainees from Gitmo to the United States every year since 2009 when we first won this battle. We won the battle back then. Why do we have to repeat it now?

If the President believes he can act without consequences, he is wrong. Again, 91 Senators voted in favor of this prohibition just last week when we passed the National Defense Authorization Act. That is not just a majority, that is a veto-proof majority. Article II of the Constitution does not provide this President—any President—with the power to ignore the law.

Just the other night in a tele-town-hall meeting, caller after caller asked if the President's actions are constitutional. The question was, How can the President do this when Congress has prohibited funding? In my view and that of the President's own Attorney General, if the President acts by Executive order, he is acting unconstitutionally.

I agree with our Founding Fathers such as George Mason who said "When the same man, or set of men, holds the sword and the purse, there is an end of liberty" and James Madison who said it is "particularly dangerous to give the keys of the treasury and the command of the army, into the same hands."

I have mentioned the Congress, the merits of Ft. Leavenworth, the Constitution, but what I have not mentioned yet are our servicemembers. We have asked so much of our men and women in uniform over the past 14 years. We have asked them to go into harm's way before every bit of equipment was ready. We have asked them to deploy and redeploy with almost no dwell time. We have asked them to extend their stays, and we have put them in more places across the globe than any period in history. They have done it all without hesitation or complaint because we have the best fighting force in the history of the world.

I am unwilling to ask them to take on the challenge of guarding enemy combatants in the United States and put their families at risk for harassment, kidnapping, or other tactics homegrown terrorists and foreign fighters have used or will use. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines do not live anonymously when their families are stationed with them, as is the case at Ft. Leavenworth.

I believe, along with many who have worn the uniform, that the attacks in

Benghazi may have broken the Nation's promise to never leave a man in harm's way. On a personal note, when I signed up to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps, I was told that if I was in harm's way, I would never be left behind. That is what the Marine Corps could do for me. The Corps would have my back either by squad—if I got in harm's way—or they would send the platoon or the company or the battalion or the regiment or the division or the whole Marine Corps, and I believed that. I still believe it as the senior marine in the Congress. The Marines would have my back.

It has been the same for generations before me and hopefully generations after—that is, until now. If we are going to ask our men and women to fight ISIS or to put their families at risk, they have to know that we have their backs.

Until that bond is restored and we have a President who is willing to lead instead of following, our Nation remains vulnerable to every terrorist organization and cell in the world. We must put national security back as our top priority. It must be our first duty in Congress and by the Commander in Chief.

I stand on the floor because America's national security is my top priority. Bringing Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States is not putting our Nation's security above politics, campaign promises, or anything else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FUNDING VETERANS PROGRAMS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the best way to fight this war on terrorism is to give the President of the United States the tools he has asked for and he needs. Part of that is fully funding support for veterans.

The Presiding Officer sits on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with me. He stood side by side with most of us on funding veterans programs.

Some of my colleagues haven't. They are happy to send people off to war and spend all the money we need but are not so generous when it comes to taking care of our men and women when they return. There are higher suicide rates, higher head injury rates, higher drug addiction rates, and higher unemployment than regular civilians. Yet people in this body, especially the tea party in the House of Representatives, sometimes don't seem to be able to find the money to spend to help veterans.

NOMINATION OF ADAM SZUBIN

Mr. BROWN. Another way to fight this war on terrorism and to help our efforts on fighting ISIS is to actually put the people in place in the U.S. Government who help us do that. I came to the floor today to join Senator CASEY—my friend from Pennsylvania who is